

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,987	10/30/2003	Chih-Ching Hsien	5687	
7590 02/03/2005		EXAMINER		
Mr. Phillip Liu 6980, Whiteoak Dr.			SMITH, JAMES G	
Richmond, BC V7E 4Z9			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CANADA			3723	

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/695,987	HSIEN, CHIH-CHING				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James G. Smith	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ Th	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdres 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers	•					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/an Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in Application or ity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	🗖					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da  5) Notice of Informal P  6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/695,987 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Double Patenting**

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-5 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/916,389. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the CIP are only different in the breadth of the claims and varying in wording and to make any device without a claimed element of limitation and its corresponding function is an obvious modification.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/695,987

Art Unit: 3723

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Chow or Arnold in view of any of Bozonnet (840 or 141) or Liao.

Either Chow or Arnold shows the claimed invention except for the use of a specific size ratio of the engaging part and/or the engaging recess. Any of Bozonnet (840 or 141) or Liao suggests that a driver/socket can have such an engagement area with a smaller opening that leads into a larger opening. It would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify either Chow or Arnold by using a shape for the engaging part and/or the engaging recess because any of Bozonnet (840 or 141) or Liao suggests the use of such a shape for these parts to be one well known in order to allow for a locking arrangement between two elements that provides also for a closer fit.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James G. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4496. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:05- 4:35) Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail, III can be reached on 571-272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James G. Smith Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723

jgs 2/2/05